

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

**RHONDA L. WILSON,**

**v.**

**NANCY A. BERRYHILL,  
Defendant.**

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**Case No. 1:17cv1279**

**ORDER**

On May 2, 2018, United States Magistrate Judge Theresa Carroll Buchanan entered a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) in this social security case, recommending that defendant’s motion for summary judgment be granted and that plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment be denied. Specifically, Judge Buchanan found (i) that the Administrative Law Judge’s (“ALJ”) decision denying plaintiff’s request for social security disability benefits was supported by substantial record evidence and (ii) that the ALJ applied the appropriate legal standards when evaluating the record evidence.

Upon consideration of the record and Judge Buchanan’s Report, to which no objections have been filed, and having found no clear error,<sup>1</sup>

The Court **ADOPTS**, as its own, the findings of fact and recommendations of Judge Buchanan as set forth in her Report (Doc. 24).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (in the absence of any objections to a magistrate’s report, the court “need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”).

Accordingly,

It is hereby **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 14) is **DENIED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 17) is **GRANTED**.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter Rule 58 judgment in favor of the defendant.

The Clerk of the Court is further directed to provide a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and to place this matter among the ended causes.

Alexandria, Virginia  
May 30, 2018

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**T. S. Ellis, III**  
**United States District Judge**

---

<sup>2</sup> The Magistrate Judge correctly stated the standard of review for a social security appeal. However, the Magistrate Judge went on to describe the threshold for reversal as "high." Although the ALJ is entitled to deference regarding evidentiary findings and credibility determinations, the undersigned would not necessarily label the degree of deference as "high." However, the Magistrate Judge's characterization of the standard of review in no way affected the soundness of her Report.